

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-14, 24, 32, 34-48 are pending in the present application, claims 34-48 having been added and claim 2 having been cancelled herein. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 12 were amended, and claims 34-48 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments and new claims will be described with reference to U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0167772, which corresponds to the present application. Support for amended claim 1 may be found *inter alia* in original claims 1, 2, 4 and 5, on page 5, paragraph 0064, and on page 9, paragraphs 0102 to 0106. Support for amended claim 12 may be found *inter alia* in original claim 12, on page 5, paragraph 0061, lines 1-8, on page 8, paragraph 0093, lines 10 to 13, and in paragraph 0095, lines 14 to 18. Support for new claim 34 is found *inter alia* on page 4, paragraph 0046, lines 1-8. Support for new claim 35, is found *inter alia* on page 9, paragraph 97, lines 7-9. Support for new claim 36 is found *inter alia* on page 7, paragraph 0075. Support for new claim 37 is found *inter alia* on page 4, paragraph 0051, lines 1-5. Support for new claim 38 is found *inter alia* in original claims 1 and 12, and on page 5, paragraph 0061, lines 1-8. Support for new claim 39 is found *inter alia* in original claims 1 and 14, and on page 5, paragraph 0061, lines 18-26. Support for new claim 40 is found *inter alia* on page 1, paragraph 0007, in the summary paragraphs added in the preliminary amendment, on page 5 paragraph

0064, on page 9, paragraphs 0102 to 0106 as well as in claims 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of published WO 2004/040491 for which the current application is the national phase. Support for new claim 41 is found *inter alia* on page 2, paragraph 0012, original claims 2, 4 and 5, on page 5, paragraph 0064, on page 9, paragraphs 0102 to 0106, and in claim 26 of published WO 2004/040491 for which the current application is the national phase. Support for new claim 42 is found *inter alia* on page 1, paragraph 0011 and in claim 25 of published WO 2004/040491 for which the current application is the national phase. Support for new claim 43 is found *inter alia* on page 2, paragraph 0017 and in claim 30 of published WO 2004/040491 for which the current application is the national phase. Support for new claim 44 is found *inter alia* on page 1, paragraph 0007, in claim 15 of published WO 2004/040491 for which the current application is the national phase, in original claim 12, and on page 5, paragraph 0061, lines 1-8. Support for new claim 45 is found *inter alia* on page 2, paragraph 0012, in claim 26 of published WO 2004/040491 for which the current application is the national phase, in original claim 12, and on page 5, paragraph 0061, lines 1-8. Support for new claim 46 is found *inter alia* on page 1, paragraph 0007, in claim 15 of published WO 2004/040491 for which the current application is the national phase, in claim 14, and on page 5, paragraph 0061, lines 18-26. Support for new claim 47 is found *inter alia* on page 2, paragraph 0012, in claim 26 of published WO 2004/040491 for which the current application is the national phase, in claim 14, and on page 5, paragraph 0061, lines 18-26. Support for new claim 48 is found *inter alia* in paragraph 0066, lines 1-5 from the top of page 6.

Unless otherwise specified herein, the current claim amendments, claim cancellations and claim additions have not necessarily been made in order to overcome prior art. For example, certain changes in the claim set may have been made to improve clarity and/or to better reflect the subject matter which the Applicant currently desires to claim. It is noted that not all possible independent and dependent claims have been added at this stage in order to save on costs. However, Applicant reserves the right to add claims, amend claims, and/or cancel claims in future prosecution of this application or in continuation applications.

Claims 1-14, 22, 24, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hamilton (U.S. Patent No. 6,968,316). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 as amended incorporates, *inter alia*, the feature "adapting at least one of said selected less than all paragraphs to includes at least part of said determined values". It is noted that original claim 2 (now cancelled) recited a non-limiting example of this feature. The Examiner stated that claim 2 was taught by Hamilton, citing column 20, lines 26-32 of column 21 and figures 4A-J. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that neither in these citations nor anywhere else in Hamilton's description of the invention, does Hamilton provide either a hint or indication of adapting paragraphs to include values.

Claim 1 as amended also includes, *inter alia*, the feature : "determining based on at least one criterion whether to retain for or exclude from evaluation said predetermined relationship, if determined not to exclude said predetermined relationship from evaluation..." It is noted that claims 4 and 5 recite non-limiting examples of when a

relationship is not evaluated (*i.e.*, excluded from examination). The Examiner stated that Hamilton teaches claim 4, citing figure 2/element 300 and description, table 4-5. The Examiner further stated that Hamilton teaches claim 5, citing Figure 2/element 300 and description, Table 25. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that neither in these citations nor anywhere else in the description of Hamilton's invention, does Hamilton provide either a hint or indication of determining based on at least one criterion whether to retain for or exclude from evaluation a relationship.

Applicant respectfully submits that since independent claim 1 is deemed new and inventive, all claims dependent on claim 1 are also deemed new and inventive. System claim 40 and Beauregard type claim 41 are also deemed new and inventive for the same reasons as stated for claim 1.

The Examiner has stated that claim 24 is similar to claim 1 with the exception that it states one variable instead of two. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 24 refers to a method where depending on the results of an evaluation of a relationship, selection of one or more interpretative paragraphs associated with the relationship may or may not take place, and therefore output of associated paragraph(s) may or may not take place. Claim 24 is new and inventive with respect to Hamilton since Hamilton does not provide either a hint or an indication that there is a possibility that no associated paragraph is outputted. System claim 42 and Beauregard-type claim 43 are also deemed new and inventive for the same reasons as stated for claim 24.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 38 is also new and inventive compared to Hamilton. It is noted that a non-limiting example of one of the features recited in claim 38, namely the evaluation of a relationship which includes comparing magnitudes of determined values with one another, was recited in original claim 12. The Examiner cited Figure 2/element 300 against original claim 12. However it is noted that Hamilton discusses comparing a variable value for an entity versus a variable value for a competitor. There would be no reason based on such a comparison to select a paragraph which is associated with the entity but not with the competitor, or *vice versa*, and it is thus not surprising that there is neither a hint nor an indication in this citation nor elsewhere in Hamilton's description of the invention of the combination of features recited in claim 38 such as relationship evaluation which includes comparing magnitudes of values with one another, choosing less than all of the variables based on the comparison, and selecting less than all of the paragraphs associated with the relationship for output based on the evaluation results, where the selected paragraph(s) are associated with the chosen variable(s).

As an aside, it is noted that claim 12 has been amended with this reply for clarity purposes to better reflect the original intent of the claim and it should therefore be evident that the citation against claim 12 is now irrelevant. System claim 44 and Beauregard-type claim 45 are also deemed new and inventive for the same reasons as stated for claim 38.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 39 is new and inventive compared to Hamilton. It is noted that claim 14 includes a non-limiting

example of a feature of claim 39, where claim 14 recites an evaluation which includes verifying that values of all of said at least two linked variables have been evaluated. The Examiner cited Figure 2, elements 300 to 500 against Claim 14. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that neither in these citations nor anywhere else in Hamilton's description of the invention, does Hamilton provide either a hint or indication of verifying that values of all of said at least two linked variables have been evaluated, as recited in claim 14. Certainly, therefore there is neither a hint nor an indication in Hamilton that an evaluation can include a decision on whether or not values of all linked variables have been determined, and that the method only proceeds to select paragraph(s) if the values of all linked variables have been determined, as recited in claim 39. System claim 46 and Beauregard-type claim 47 are also deemed new and inventive for the same reasons as stated for claim 39.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-14, 24, 32, 34-48 are patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Appln. No. 10/533,445  
Amdt. dated May 30, 2008  
Reply to Office action of January 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By     /Ronni S. Jillions/      
Ronni S. Jillions  
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:me  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\bn\c\cohn\zilberman1\pto\2008-05-30AmendmentZILBERMAN1.doc